IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 05-cv-329-GKF(PJC)
)	
TYSON FOODS, INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendan	ts.)	

STATE OF OKLAHOMA'S REPLY IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE EXPERT TESTIMONY OF DEFENDANTS' WITNESS VICTOR BIERMAN Ph.D. [DKT# 2063]

Plaintiff, the State of Oklahoma ("the State") has moved, pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 104 and 702, and *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579 (1993), for an order *in limine* precluding the expert testimony of Defendants' witness Victor Bierman, Ph.D. ("Dr. Bierman") regarding his testimony critiquing the State's expert witness Bernard Engel, Ph.D. ("Dr. Engel"). The State has advanced two grounds for exclusion in its *Daubert* motion.

First, the State urges that Dr. Bierman does not have expertise in the scientific discipline of watershed runoff and hydrologic/water quality modeling¹ ("Watershed Modeling") to support his opinions concerning Dr. Engel's work in that area. Defendants respond by arguing Dr. Bierman (1) was *part of a team* of experts that worked on a water quality analysis that included

Persons who are professionally engaged and active in their careers performing Watershed Modeling are typically members of the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineering (ASABE). The ASABE is the leading professional organization for watershed runoff and hydrologic/water quality modeling professionals. Peer reviewed papers of the Society are published in "Transactions of ASABE." "Applied Engineering in Agriculture" is another peer reviewed journal that the ASABE publishes. Dr. Bierman is not a member of this society. Based on his deposition he does not read these journals and has not published a paper on Watershed Modeling in these or any other scientific journal. *See* Exhibit A (Bierman Depo., 186:12-22, 191:5-22 & 282:1-283:2).

Watershed Modeling; (2) gained his experience in this discipline while working on this case; (3) has performed similar work in the past; and (4) is qualified to opine as to land use/land cover data and its interpretation because he trusts his staff's work and interpretation of the data. This "background" does not qualify Dr. Bierman as an expert in Watershed Modeling.

Second, the State urges that Dr. Bierman failed to perform any specific analysis or gather specific information to support his opinions. In response, Defendants contend that Dr. Bierman has performed a specific analysis to support his opinions because he: (1) toured the IRW, (2) read other people's expert reports, and (3) has run a "sensitivity" analysis on Dr. Engel's model. An analysis of these arguments serves only to further demonstrate Dr. Bierman's lack of the knowledge and qualifications required to critique Dr. Engel's work.² Furthermore, Defendants' arguments are contradicted by Dr. Bierman's deposition testimony.

I. Discussion

A. Dr. Bierman lacks the requisite knowledge and experience to opine as an expert in Watershed Modeling.

The Court must determine if the proffered expert is qualified by "knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education" to render an opinion. *See Ralston v. Smith & Nephew Richards, Inc.*, 275 F.3d 965, 969 (10th Cir. 2001). While many Ph.D.s are qualified to be experts, it is important for a court to delineate exactly the discipline in which the person's expertise lies and whether this specific expertise supports the matters about which he / she proposes to testify. *See Berry v. City of Detroit*, 25 F.3d 1342, 1351 (6th Cir. 1994), *cert*.

In fact, Defendants have moved to exclude Dr. Engels analysis under *Daubert* based on the analysis and opinions provided by Dr. Bierman. *See* DKT #2056. As demonstrated by the State's response to that motion, *see* DKT #2157, the arguments proposed by Dr. Bierman are *prima facie* evidence that he is *not* an expert in Watershed Modeling; neither is he able to refer to any peer reviewed scientific papers or an actual analysis he performed to support his modeling critique.

denied, 513 U.S. 1111, 115 S. Ct. 902, (1995); see also, Wheeling Pittsburgh Steel Corp. v. Beelman River Terminals, Inc., 254 F.3d 706, 715 (8th Cir. 2001) ("To begin with, we agree with the district court that Dr. Curtis . . . easily qualifies as an expert under Federal Rule of Evidence 702. The real question is, what is he an expert about?") (emphasis added); Westfed Holdings, Inc. v. United States, 55 Fed. Cl. 544, 571 (2003), rev'd in part on other grounds, 407 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2005). This Court has stated:

Ralston and like cases establish that the qualification of the proposed expert is to be assessed only after the specific matters he proposes to address have been identified. The controlling Tenth Circuit cases, exemplified by Ralston, establish that the expert's qualifications must be both (i) adequate in a general, qualitative sense (i.e., "knowledge, skill, experience, training or education" as required by Rule 702) and (ii) specific to the matters he proposes to address as an expert.

In re Williams Sec. Litig., 496 F. Supp. 2d 1195, 1232 & 1245 (N.D. Okla. 2007)

(Emphasis added). Defendants' arguments fail to establish that Dr. Bierman has the requisite expertise in Watershed Modeling to offer opinions on Dr. Engel's IRW model.

To begin with, Dr. Bierman has already admitted that he has no previous hands-on experience in Watershed Modeling. *See*, DKT #2063, Ex. B (Bierman Depo. 16:10-13, 19:23 – 20:16, 22:1-21, 24:5 – 25:11, 30:25 - 31:9, 36:6-18, 45:8-12, 84:13-23, 110:19 – 111:14, 160:18 – 162:13, & 328:8-10) and Exhibit A (Bierman Depo. 282:1-283:2). Dr. Bierman has also plainly stated that he is not an expert in watershed hydrology. *See* DKT #2063, Ex. B (Bierman Depo. 80:16 – 81:10). And he is not a member of a professional society of watershed modelers and has not authored peer reviewed papers which used Watershed Modeling as an investigative tool. Dr. Bierman's *admitted* lack of knowledge and experience in these areas clearly disqualifies him as an expert in the area of Watershed Modeling and renders his opinions on Dr. Engel's Model unreliable and inadmissible.

In their response, Defendants first argue that Dr. Bierman has become an expert in watershed and runoff modeling through his review of two studies and being a part of a project team where others on the team did the Watershed Modeling. See DKT #2138, at fn 6. It is important to note that Dr. Bierman did not do the modeling in these instances. Rather he merely reviewed the studies for comment or worked with others on a project where other scientists actually performed the Watershed Modeling. Defendants' argument is misleading and overstates Dr. Bierman's experience. Dr. Bierman did not perform the Watershed Modeling in any of the referenced studies cited by Defendants. See DKT #2138, at p. 7 (describing Dr. Bierman's level of participation in several studies that involved modeling, and in none of which was he the modeler). While Dr. Bierman may have expertise in some areas of modeling, his opinions in this case do not address the types of modeling where he has experience and might have some expertise -- namely, in stream and in lake modeling. Much like the experts whose testimony was excluded in Ralston and In re Williams, Dr. Bierman is being offered to give opinions on subject matters where he lacks relevant expertise.

Second, in an attempt to overcome this admitted lack of expertise, Defendants argue that Dr. Bierman consulted studies, after being retained, which provided him the necessary expertise and knowledge of the IRW to opine on Dr. Engel's Watershed Modeling of the IRW. See DKT #2138, at p. 5. Defendants' argument misses the mark. Work to educate oneself in a complex scientific discipline after one is retained is not sufficient experience to qualify one as an expert, anymore than it is sufficient to qualify as an expert on the basis that Defendants have hired one to become one. That is particularly true in a field as complex as Watershed Modeling. The "expert" needs to come to the task with real expertise. Dr. Bierman clearly lacks such expertise. Defendants next argue that since the "basic scientific principles" behind Dr. Engel's model are *similar* to the basic scientific principles behind models Dr. Bierman is familiar with, he may critique Dr. Engel as an expert. *See* DKT #2138, at p. 6. The fact that the work involves similar basic principles is not enough; Dr. Bierman's experience falls far short of the legal requirement of the specific knowledge required of an expert. *See In re Williams Sec. Litig.*, 496 F. Supp. 2d at 1232 & 1245 (the expert's qualifications must be both (i) adequate in a general, qualitative sense (*i.e.*, "knowledge, skill, experience, training or education" as required by Rule 702) and (ii) specific to the matters he proposes to address as an expert.).³ Second, Defendants admit that Dr. Bierman is not an expert in hydrology, rather that he merely possesses, "knowledge of hydrology." *See* DKT #2138, at p. 6. Yet they contend that this general knowledge alone qualifies him as an expert in this case.

Despite Defendants' arguments to the contrary, Dr. Bierman's own testimony reveals his lack of experience with the specific type of Watershed Modeling performed by Dr. Engel:

Q How often have you worked with the GLEAMS model, not including this project?

A The GLEAMS model as a tool or the process-based deterministic mass balance science in GLEAMS?

Q No. I'm talking about the GLEAMS model as a tool.

A Not before this project.

Q What about the SWAT model; how often have you used that model as a tool?

A I have not used SWAT.

DKT #2063, Ex. B (Bierman Depo., 84:13-23); *see also, id.* (Bierman Depo. 160:18-161:16). It is clear from Dr. Bierman's statements under oath that he possesses neither the general nor the specific knowledge and experience needed for him to opine in this case.

For example, knowledge of automobile engine mechanics does not qualify someone to opine on the cause of an airplane engine's failure.

Q Do you have experience in interpreting aerial photo such as presented in the NLCD dataset?A I personally do not.

DKT #2063, Ex. B (Bierman Depo. 313:3-5). In the face of this admission Defendants claim that Dr. Bierman should still be allowed to critique Dr. Engel's use of the NLCD dataset.

Defendants argue that experts may rely on others. *See* DKT #2138, at p. 12-13. The State does not contend that experts may not rely on others for facts or assistance with data analysis. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 703. However, what Defendants ask this Court to do in this instance goes beyond mere assistance; Defendants are asking the Court to impute knowledge and skills of Dr. Bierman's employees to Dr. Bierman -- specifically, skills and knowledge that he does not possess. The interpretation of the NLCD data was undertaken by staff who are not testifying at trial. Dr. Bierman even admits that he has no knowledge of the methods these staff members used to critique Dr. Engel's report. *See* DKT #2063, Ex. B (Bierman Depo. 317:19-318:1). Parroting the opinions formed by others who used methods that are not understood by the testifying "expert" is not sufficient. Dr. Bierman's inability to explain how his staff came to their conclusions reveals his obvious lack of expertise in this area and should render his testimony as to these opinions inadmissible.

B. Defendants' new arguments that Dr. Bierman has now performed analysis or gathered specific information to support his opinions are false and not supported by the record

Defendants, in response to the State's argument that Dr. Bierman has performed no analysis or gathered any specific information to support his opinions make three arguments. First, Defendants argue that Dr. Bierman's visit to the IRW constitutes a, "personal experience of studying or gathering data." *See* DKT #2138, at p. 4. Defendants miss the mark when they attempt to describe Dr. Bierman's short visit to the IRW as a scientific study:

In June of 2006, Dr. Bierman spent several days thoroughly touring the IRW.... took an aerial tour of the IRW... took a driving tour of the watershed... floated two separate sections of the Illinois River in Oklahoma.

See DKT #2138, at p. 5. No doubt this was an interesting couple of days. Dr. Bierman with no experience in Watershed Modeling, may have also found it to be informative. But, Defendants are stretching when they attempt to make it into something more. It is clear from his testimony that Defendants' claims that this visit establishes a basis for a claim that Dr. Bierman went about

a process of gathering modeling information is baseless. Contrary to Defendants' suggestions, Dr. Bierman has never claimed that he performed any sampling or hydrologic analysis during this brief visit.

Second, Defendants claim that simply by being hired as an expert and reviewing other expert reports in this case (including the State's expert reports), Dr. Bierman has gathered sufficient information to provide expert testimony on Watershed Modeling and to opine as to supposed errors in Dr. Engel's model. *See* DKT #2138, at p. 5. While it may be true that Dr. Bierman has advanced his knowledge through his work in this case, that does not mean he has gathered the specific information needed to test and support his opinions. It simply is not sufficient for a person who has not previously performed the complex task of Watershed Modeling to qualify as an expert merely on the basis of having read reports prepared by others. Such experience certainly does not qualify one to critique the work of others.

Lastly, Defendants' have reinvented Dr. Bierman's analysis in Section 3 of his report as a "sensitivity analysis" in order to claim that he did at least one test or analysis to support an opinion. Defendants claim that Dr. Bierman performed, "extensive sensitivity analyses" on Dr. Engel's models. *See* DKT #2138, at pp. 10-11. This statement is patently false and contradicts Dr. Bierman's report. He never describes his analysis as a sensitivity analysis in his report. *See* DKT #2138, Ex. 1 (Bierman Rpt. at pp. 29-31). Defendants have wrongly classified a part of Dr. Bierman's report as a sensitivity analysis to salvage their expert. What Dr. Bierman performed was an attempted *calibration* which is something entirely different then a modeling *sensitivity analysis*. While Defendants may try to argue that Dr. Bierman has, in fact, validated his

Section D.5.1 of the EPA Guidance on Models document relied on by Defendants discusses model sensitivity analysis. *See* DKT #2138 Ex. 6 (U.S. EPA, Guidance on the

opinions through scientific testing in the calibration discussed in Section 3 of his report, this is simply not the case. His statements made under oath stand in sharp contrast to Defendants' claims. *See* DKT #2063, Ex. B (Bierman Depo. 56:16-57:1, 57:24-58:4, 61:15-18, 196:2-7). It is clear from Dr. Bierman's statements that despite Defendants' arguments to the contrary Dr. Bierman, in fact, performed no sensitivity analysis to confirm his opinions.

One simply cannot make the claim that Dr. Engel's model does not represent real world conditions without knowing what those real world conditions are. *See* DKT #2063, at pp. 6-8. Due to the fact that his opinions do not rest on specific relevant scientific facts or analysis, his testimony is revealed as a pure case of *ipse dixit* and must be excluded pursuant to *Daubert*.

II. Conclusion

WHEREFORE, in light of the foregoing, this Court should enter an order *in limine* precluding Dr. Bierman from offering opinions on Watershed Modeling generally and Dr. Engel's IRW model specifically.

Respectfully Submitted,

W.A. Drew Edmondson OBA # 2628 ATTORNEY GENERAL Kelly H. Burch OBA #17067 ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL State of Oklahoma 313 N.E. 21st St. Oklahoma City, OK 73105 (405) 521-3921

/s/ David P. Page

M. David Riggs OBA #7583
Joseph P. Lennart OBA #5371
Richard T. Garren OBA #3253
Sharon K. Weaver OBA #19010
Robert A. Nance OBA #6581
D. Sharon Gentry OBA #15641
David P. Page OBA #6852
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN,
ORBISON & LEWIS
502 West Sixth Street
Tulsa, OK 74119
(918) 587-3161

Louis W. Bullock OBA #1305 Robert M. Blakemore OBA 18656 BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE 110 West Seventh Street Suite 707 Tulsa OK 74119 (918) 584-2001

Frederick C. Baker (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth C. Ward (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Elizabeth Claire Xidis (admitted *pro hac vice*)
MOTLEY RICE, LLC
28 Bridgeside Boulevard
Mount Pleasant, SC 29465
(843) 216-9280

William H. Narwold (admitted *pro hac vice*) Ingrid L. Moll (admitted *pro hac vice*) MOTLEY RICE, LLC 20 Church Street, 17th Floor Hartford, CT 06103 (860) 882-1676

Jonathan D. Orent (admitted *pro hac vice)* Michael G. Rousseau (admitted *pro hac vice)* Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick (admitted *pro hac vice)* MOTLEY RICE, LLC 321 South Main Street Providence, RI 02940 (401) 457-7700

Attorneys for the State of Oklahoma

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this <u>18th</u> day of <u>June</u>, 2009, I electronically transmitted the above and foregoing pleading to the Clerk of the Court using the ECF System for filing and a transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

W. A. Drew Edmondson, Attorney General	fc_docket@oag.state.ok.us	
Kelly H. Burch, Assistant Attorney General	kelly_burch@oag.state.ok.us	
M. David Riggs	driggs@riggsabney.com	
Joseph P. Lennart	jlennart@riggsabney.com	
Richard T. Garren	rgarren@riggsabney.com	
Sharon K. Weaver	sweaver@riggsabney.com	
Robert A. Nance	rnance@riggsabney.com	
D. Sharon Gentry	sgentry@riggsabney.com	
David P. Page	dpage@riggsabney.com	
RIGGS, ABNEY, NEAL, TURPEN, ORBISON & LEWIS		

Louis Werner Bullock	lbullock@bullock-blakemore.com	
Robert M. Blakemore	bblakemore@bullock-blakemore.com	
BULLOCK, BULLOCK & BLAKEMORE	Columnia Colonia Chianterina Colonia	
,		
Frederick C. Baker	fbaker@motleyrice.com	
Elizabeth C. Ward	lward@motleyrice.com	
Elizabeth Claire Xidis	cxidis@motleyrice.com	
William H. Narwold	bnarwold@motleyrice.com	
Ingrid L. Moll	imoll@motleyrice.com	
Jonathan D. Orent	jorent@motleyrice.com	
Michael G. Rousseau	mrousseau@motleyrice.com	
Fidelma L. Fitzpatrick	ffitzpatrick@motleyrice.com	
MOTLEY RICE, LLC		
Counsel for State of Oklahoma		
Robert P. Redemann	rredemann@pmrlaw.net	
PERRINE, MCGIVERN, REDEMANN, REID, BA	RRY & TAYLOR, P.L.L.C.	
David C. Senger	david@cgmlawok.com	
Robert E Sanders	rsanders@youngwilliams.com	
Edwin Stephen Williams	steve.williams@youngwilliams.com	
YOUNG WILLIAMS P.A.		
Counsel for Cal-Maine Farms, Inc and Cal-Main	ne Foods, Inc.	
John H. Tucker	jtucker@rhodesokla.com	
Theresa Noble Hill	thill@rhodesokla.com	
Colin Hampton Tucker	ctucker@rhodesokla.com	
Kerry R. Lewis	klewis@rhodesokla.com	
RHODES, HIERONYMUS, JONES, TUCKER & O	GABLE	
Terry Wayen West	terry@thewestlawfirm.com	
THE WEST LAW FIRM		
Delmar R. Ehrich	dehrich@faegre.com	
Bruce Jones	bjones@faegre.com	
Krisann C. Kleibacker Lee	kklee@faegre.com	
Todd P. Walker	twalker@faegre.com	
Christopher H. Dolan	cdolan@faegre.com	
Melissa C. Collins	mcollins@faegre.com	
Colin C. Deihl	cdeihl@faegre.com	
Randall E. Kahnke	rkahnke@faegre.com	

FAEGRE & BENSON, LLP			
Dara D. Mann			
	dmann@mckennalong.com		
MCKENNA, LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP Counsel for Cargill, Inc. & Cargill Turkey Production, LLC			
Counsel for Cargin, flic. & Cargin Turkey Front			
James Martin Graves	jgraves@bassettlawfirm.com		
Gary V Weeks	gweeks@bassettlawfirm.com		
Woody Bassett	wbassett@bassettlawfirm.com		
K. C. Dupps Tucker	kctucker@bassettlawfirm.com		
Earl Lee "Buddy" Chadick	bchadick@bassettlawfirm.com		
BASSETT LAW FIRM			
George W. Owens	gwo@owenslawfirmpc.com		
Randall E. Rose	rer@owenslawfirmpc.com		
OWENS LAW FIRM, P.C.	101 WO Wensia Will impercom		
Counsel for George's Inc. & George's Farms, Inc.	c.		
A. Scott McDaniel	smcdaniel@mhla-law.com		
Nicole Longwell	nlongwell@mhla-law.com		
Philip Hixon	phixon@mhla-law.com		
Craig A. Merkes	cmerkes@mhla-law.com		
MCDANIEL, HIXON, LONGWELL & ACORD, F			
- , , - ,, - ,- ,- ,- ,- ,- ,- ,- ,- ,-			
Sherry P. Bartley	sbartley@mwsgw.com		
MITCHELL, WILLIAMS, SELIG, GATES & WOO	ODYARD, PLLC		
Counsel for Peterson Farms, Inc.			
John Elrod	jelrod@cwlaw.com		
Vicki Bronson	vbronson@cwlaw.com		
P. Joshua Wisley	jwisley@cwlaw.com		
Bruce W. Freeman	bfreeman@cwlaw.com		
D. Richard Funk	rfunk@cwlaw.com		
CONNER & WINTERS, LLP			
Counsel for Simmons Foods, Inc.			
Stephen L. Jantzen	sjantzen@ryanwhaley.com		
Paula M. Buchwald	pbuchwald@ryanwhaley.com		
Patrick M. Ryan	pryan@ryanwhaley.com		
RYAN, WHALEY, COLDIRON & SHANDY, P.C	11 0 0 1		

Mark D. Hopson	mhopson@sidley.com	
Jay Thomas Jorgensen	jjorgensen@sidley.com	
Timothy K. Webster	twebster@sidley.com	
Thomas C. Green	tcgreen@sidley.com	
Gordon D. Todd	gtodd@sidley.com	
SIDLEY, AUSTIN, BROWN & WOOD LLP	,	
Robert W. George	robert.george@tyson.com	
L. Bryan Burns	bryan.burns@tyson.com	
Timothy T. Jones	tim.jones@tyson.com	
TYSON FOODS, INC	_	
Michael R. Bond	michael.bond@kutakrock.com	
Erin W. Thompson	erin.thompson@kutakrock.com	
Dustin R. Darst	dustin.darst@kutakrock.com	
KUTAK ROCK, LLP		
Counsel for Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Poultry, In	c., Tyson Chicken, Inc., & Cobb-Vantress, Inc.	
R. Thomas Lay	rtl@kiralaw.com	
KERR, IRVINE, RHODES & ABLES	Ttitekiraiaw.com	
Frank M. Evans, III	fevans@lathropgage.com	
Jennifer Stockton Griffin	jgriffin@lathropgage.com	
David Gregory Brown	Jg/11111@idtill/opgage.com	
LATHROP & GAGE LC		
Counsel for Willow Brook Foods, Inc.		
Counsel for Trimon Droom Loods, Inc.		
Robin S Conrad	rconrad@uschamber.com	
NATIONAL CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER	100maa@asenamoor.com	
THE THE CHARLES BETTER THOSE CENTER		
Gary S Chilton	gchilton@hcdattorneys.com	
HOLLADAY, CHILTON AND DEGIUSTI, PLLC		
Counsel for US Chamber of Commerce and Ame	rican Tort Reform Association	
=		
D. Kenyon Williams, Jr.	kwilliams@hallestill.com	
Michael D. Graves	mgraves@hallestill.com	
HALL, ESTILL, HARDWICK, GABLE, GOLDEN		
Counsel for Poultry Growers/Interested Parties/		
Comment to a country Cromers/anterested Lattics/	A CHANA J. A BER DARVE OF ARRUE	
Richard Ford	richard.ford@crowedunlevy.com	
LeAnne Burnett	leanne.burnett@crowedunlevy.com	
CROWE & DUNLEVY		

Counsel for Oklahoma Farm Bureau, Inc.		
Kendra Akin Jones, Assistant Attorney General	Kendra.Jones@arkansasag.gov	
Charles L. Moulton, Sr Assistant Attorney General	Charles.Moulton@arkansasag.gov	
Counsel for State of Arkansas and Arkansas Na	tional Resources Commission	
Mark Richard Mullins	richard.mullins@mcafeetaft.com	
MCAFEE & TAFT	Tionard.mamms(g)mouroctart.com	
Counsel for Texas Farm Bureau; Texas Cattle 1	Feeders Association: Texas Pork Producers	
Association and Texas Association of Dairymen		
Mia Vahlberg	mvahlberg@gablelaw.com	
GABLE GOTWALS	mvamooig@gaoiciaw.com	
OUDDE GOT HUIDS		
James T. Banks	jtbanks@hhlaw.com	
Adam J. Siegel	ajsiegel@hhlaw.com	
<u> </u>		
HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	 lltry and Egg Association & National Turkey	
HOGAN & HARTSON, LLP Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Por Federation	lltry and Egg Association & National Turkey	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Por	altry and Egg Association & National Turkey	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pou Federation		
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Por Federation John D. Russell	iltry and Egg Association & National Turkey jrussell@fellerssnider.com	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pou Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY		
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Por Federation John D. Russell		
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pou Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC	jrussell@fellerssnider.com	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pou Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr.	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pour Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate	jrussell@fellerssnider.com	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pour Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pour Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pour Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net dchoate@fec.net	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pour Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation Barry Greg Reynolds	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net dchoate@fec.net reynolds@titushillis.com	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Por Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation Barry Greg Reynolds Jessica E. Rainey	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net dchoate@fec.net	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Por Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation Barry Greg Reynolds Jessica E. Rainey TITUS, HILLIS, REYNOLDS, LOVE,	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net dchoate@fec.net reynolds@titushillis.com	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Por Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation Barry Greg Reynolds Jessica E. Rainey	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net dchoate@fec.net reynolds@titushillis.com	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pour Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation Barry Greg Reynolds Jessica E. Rainey TITUS, HILLIS, REYNOLDS, LOVE, DICKMAN & MCCALMON	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net dchoate@fec.net reynolds@titushillis.com jrainey@titushillis.com	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pour Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation Barry Greg Reynolds Jessica E. Rainey TITUS, HILLIS, REYNOLDS, LOVE, DICKMAN & MCCALMON Nikaa Baugh Jordan	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net dchoate@fec.net reynolds@titushillis.com jrainey@titushillis.com njordan@lightfootlaw.com	
Counsel for National Chicken Council; U.S. Pour Federation John D. Russell FELLERS, SNIDER, BLANKENSHIP, BAILEY & TIPPENS, PC William A. Waddell, Jr. David E. Choate FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK, LLP Counsel for Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation Barry Greg Reynolds Jessica E. Rainey TITUS, HILLIS, REYNOLDS, LOVE, DICKMAN & MCCALMON	jrussell@fellerssnider.com waddell@fec.net dchoate@fec.net reynolds@titushillis.com jrainey@titushillis.com	

Duane L. Berlin	dberlin@levberlin.com	
LEV & BERLIN PC		
Counsel for Council of American Survey Research Organizations & American Association for		
Public Opinion Research		

Also on this 18th day of June, 2009 I mailed a copy of the above and foregoing pleading to:

Thomas C Green -- via email: tcgreen@sidley.com Sidley, Austin, Brown & Wood LLP

Dustin McDaniel Justin AllenOffice of the Attorney General (Little Rock)
323 Center St, Ste 200
Little Rock, AR 72201-2610

Steven B. Randall 58185 County Rd 658 Kansas, Ok 74347

Cary Silverman -- via email: csilverman@shb.com Victor E Schwartz Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP (Washington DC)

/s/ David P. Page
David P. Page